



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,063	04/30/2001	Ming Zhou	GEI-001US 29083	4555
21718	7590	07/26/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC SUITE 500 421 W RIVERSIDE SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER RUTTEN, JAMES D	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,063

Applicant(s)

ZHOU ET AL.

Examiner

J. Derek Rutten

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55 and 57-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55 and 57-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Applicant's submission filed 5/3/07, responding to the 1/5/07 Office action which detailed the rejection of claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55, and 57-72. No claims have been amended, canceled, or added relative to prior submissions. Claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55, and 57-72 remain pending in the application and have been fully considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/3/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 11-15, Applicants generally appear to be arguing that the cited portions of *Lakritz* referenced in the rejections of the claims, occur in different systems (e.g. master site vs. template vs. parser) and are not combinable to form the invention as claimed in the instant application. Applicants further argue alleged limitations of specific portions of the reference. While the rejection may cite different portions of *Lakritz* that relate to different embodiments of the invention, *Lakritz* essentially uses the same components to carry out each embodiment, i.e. the Visitor module 101, Developer module 102, and Workflow Manager module 103, each connected to some type of database (see Fig. 1). A citation to a description of a specific embodiment still provides description of the invention as a whole. However, for simplification and clarification, *Lakritz*' disclosure of template generation anticipates the claims. As described in *Lakritz* column 6 line 50 – column 7 line 2, original locale-sensitive content is removed from a document and thereby produces a “compiled” document (see column 6 lines 66-67). The

Art Unit: 2192

original locale-sensitive content is stored in a database. Note that *Lakritz* describes retrieving the original content from some type of database. See column 6 lines 58-64:

A template contains placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document. This information is dynamically inserted from a TermDB 508 (an external glossary), another template or document located in a database or file system 509, or provided automatically by the Developer module 502 when the composite document is presented to the browser 501. [emphasis added]

Therefore, storage of such content is inherent since if it were not first stored it would not be able to be retrieved. Further, *Lakritz* provides a more explicit discussion of such storage in the related discussion of a master site building in column 5 lines 11-14 and in the discussion of parsing in column 7 lines 38-40. This removed content is substituted with a function call which populates the document to provide the desired locale-sensitive content at runtime (see column 6 lines 50-54, also column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2). Therefore, Applicants arguments are not persuasive.

On pages 16-17, Applicants argue that *Lakritz*'s parser does not properly "compile" a document. However, as seen in the description of the parser in column 7 lines 22-26, "translatable text is extracted in the same manner as if it had been specially tagged." Thus, *Lakritz*'s parser "compiles" documents in the same manner as previous discussion regarding specially tagged templates, which discloses compiling documents by extracting and removing original locale-sensitive content. Further arguments are similar to previous arguments, that *Lakritz*'s parser embodiment (see column 7 line 20 – column 8 line 63) is incompatible with the master site embodiment (see column 5 line 10 – column 6 line 49). However, *Lakritz*'s disclosure provides multiple embodiments of the same invention, and the cited portions are used to show explicit details of the system. The database of the "master site" embodiment is used in

Art Unit: 2192

the same manner as the database used with the parser. As such, the database is interchangeable between the two embodiments. Therefore, Applicants arguments are not persuasive.

Further arguments presented on pages 17-21 are similar to previously addressed arguments, and are not persuasive for the reasons presented above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55, and 57-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,623,529 to Lakritz (hereinafter “Lakritz”).

In regard to claim 20, Lakritz discloses:

A method (see column 2 lines 28-34) comprising:

compiling a computer-servable document written for a particular locale to extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content, the compiling producing a compiled document with locale-independent elements; See

Art Unit: 2192

column 6 line 66 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “replace this information with appropriate tags...”

storing the original locale-sensitive content; see column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. “database.” Also column 7 lines 38-40. Also, column 6 lines 58-64 inherently discloses storage of original locale-sensitive content since such content could not later be inserted without it first being stored.

substituting a function call in place of associated removed original locale-sensitive content in the compiled document; and See column 7 line 1, e.g. “tags and commands”

at runtime, retrieving the compiled document and populating the compiled document with a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content, See column 2 lines 28-34, e.g. “directs the Web server to deliver the appropriate localized content;” Also see column 6 lines 50-54, e.g. “dynamically create documents.”

wherein the populating comprises executing the function call in the compiled document to obtain the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content and to insert the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content back into the compiled document. See column 7 line 1, e.g. “commands,” as supported by section 3.6.3.1 “WPReplace” in column 30 at line 61. The WPReplace directs the server to populate the compiled document with locale-sensitive content before serving to the client. Also note column 31 line 3, e.g. “string to be replaced” indicates that the locale-sensitive content is inserted in the compiled document.

In regard to claim 21, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the original locale-sensitive content comprises natural language text*. See column 2 lines 28-34.

In regard to claim 22, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the locale-independent elements comprise source code and formatting data*. See column 7 lines 27-30.

In regard to claim 23, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the storing comprises storing the original locale-sensitive content in a structured text file*. See column 27 lines 23-24.

In regard to claim 24, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the storing comprises storing the original locale sensitive content in a database file*. See column 27 lines 23-24.

In regard to claim 26, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *storing one or more translated versions of the original locale-sensitive content corresponding to one or more respective other locales*. See column 27 lines 26-28.

In regard to claim 32, Lakritz discloses:

A system (See Fig. 2) comprising:

at least one computer-servable document stored in a computer-readable medium, the document being written for a particular locale; See column 6 lines 66-67, also column 7 lines 28-29, e.g. "document."

a compiler to automatically extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content from the document to produce a compiled document containing locale-independent elements, See column 6 lines 66-67, also column 7 lines 41-42, e.g. "parser."

wherein the compiler stores the original locale-sensitive content in a data structure separate from the compiled document, and See column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. "placed in a ... database." Also, column 6 lines 58-64 inherently discloses storage of original locale-sensitive content since such content could not later be inserted without it first being stored.

wherein the compiler substitutes a function call in place of associated removed original locale-sensitive content in the compiled document; See column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2, e.g. "replace...with...tags and commands."

a runtime manager that, prior to serving, populates the compiled document with a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content, See column 2 lines 38-43, e.g. "filling in a document." Also see column 6 lines 50-54, e.g. "dynamically create documents."

wherein the function call is configured such that, when executed at runtime, the function call obtains the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive

content from the data structure and inserts the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content back into the compiled document. See column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “command” in view of column 29 lines 62-63, e.g. “replaces a string with its translation.”

In regard to claims 33 and 34 the above rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 21 and 22, respectively.

In regard to claim 35, the above rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the compiler examines source code in the document to determine, from the source code, whether any original locale-sensitive content is present.* See column 7 lines 28-29.

In regard to claim 40, the above rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the original locale-sensitive content is translated into at least one translated version of the content corresponding to at least one other respective locale.* See column 7 lines 38-40.

In regard to claim 49, Lakritz discloses:

A system (See Fig. 2) comprising:

compilation means for compiling a computer-servable document written for a particular locale to extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content, the compilation means producing a compiled document with locale-independent elements; See column 6 lines 66-67, also column 7 lines 41-42, e.g.

“parser.”

storage means for storing the original locale-sensitive content extracted from the computer-servable document in a data structure separate from the compiled document, column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. “placed in a ... database.” Also, column 6 lines 58-64 inherently discloses storage of original locale-sensitive content since such content could not later be inserted without it first being stored.

wherein the compilation means comprises substitution means for substituting a function in place of associated removed original locale-sensitive content in the compiled document, the function representing the associated removed original locale-sensitive content extracted from the compiled document; See column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “replace...with...tags and commands.”

further comprising runtime means for populating, at runtime, the compiled document with a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content to reconstruct the computer-servable document, See column 29 lines 62-63, e.g. “replaces a string with its translation.” Also see column 6 lines 50-54, e.g. “dynamically create documents.”

wherein the populating comprises executing the function call in the compiled document to obtain the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content and to insert the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content back

into the compiled document. See column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “command” in view of section 3.6.3.1 “WPReplace” in column 30 at line 61.

In regard to claim 52, the above rejection of claim 49 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the locale- sensitive content is translated into another version for use in another locale.* See column 7 lines 42-48.

In regard to claim 55, Lakritz discloses:

One or more computer-readable media comprising computer-executable instructions (see column 57 line 65 – column 58 line 34) *that, when executed, direct a computer to:*

examine source code in a document written for a particular locale; See column 6 lines 66-67. Also column 7 lines 28-30, e.g. “identify translatable text.”

extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content from the source code; See column 6 line 66 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “remove as much country an language-specific information as possible.”

store the original locale-sensitive content in a separate file; and see column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. “database.” Also, column 6 lines 58-64 inherently discloses storage of original locale-sensitive content since such content could not later be inserted without it first being stored.

substitute in place of the removed original locale-sensitive content in the document, function calls which, when executed at runtime, re-supply a desired version of

the original locale-sensitive content to the document. See column 6 line 67 - column 7 line 1, e.g. “replace ... with appropriate tags and commands;” also See section 3.6.3.1 “WPReplace” in column 30 at line 61.

In regard to claim 57, the above rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *receiving a request for the computer-servable document, wherein the request contains an identity of a desired locale, the desired locale associated with the desired version of the original locale-sensitive content, wherein the populating comprises, at runtime, executing the function call in the compiled document to obtain the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content based on the request;* See column 17 lines 65-67, e.g. “request.”

and forwarding the computer-servable document with the desired version of the original locale-sensitive content in reply to the request. See column 17 lines 31-33, e.g. “served.”

In regard to claim 58, the above rejection of claim 57 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the request is a client request received by a server system, via a network.* See column 17 lines 35 and 67, also see column 2 lines 58-60.

In regard to claim 59, the above rejection of claim 58 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the computer-servable document is a web page.* See column 2 lines 19-25.

In regard to claim 60, the above rejection of claim 58 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the server system implements a multi-layer architecture, wherein the multi-layer architecture comprises a business logic layer for processing the client request according to an associated problem domain.* See Fig. 2., column 4 lines 46-54, e.g. “Visitor module”, and column 12 lines 57-61, e.g. “domain.”

In regard to claims 61-64, the above rejection of claim 40 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

In regard to claims 65-68, the above rejection of claim 52 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

In regard to claims 69-72, the above rejection of claim 55 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2192

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (571)272-3703. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jdr



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER